

<b>Committee:</b>	Planning Policy Working Group	<b>Date:</b>	23 May 2018
<b>Title:</b>	Local Plan Evidence Base		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Stephen Miles, Planning Policy Team Leader, 01799 510346	<b>Item for decision:</b>	No

---

## Summary

1. This report sets out the evidence base that is being produced to inform the next stage of consultation on the Local Plan. The below evidence base reports are brought before the working group today, and are appended to this report.
  - Paper on Garden Communities Trajectory (p.33)
  - Paper on stepping the housing trajectory (p.41)
  - Water Cycle Study Phase 2 (p.49)
  - Transport Study update (p.115)
  - Brief Archaeological Impact Assessment (p.397)
  - Draft Full Heritage Impact Assessment (p.439)
  - Retail Study update (p.719)
  - Infrastructure Delivery Plan (p.1013)
2. This report also provides an update on the below work.
  - Update on the Whole Plan Viability Study
  - Update on the Hatfield Forest Work
  - Update on the Epping Forest Work
  - Update on the Sports and Playing Pitches Study

## Recommendations

3. That Planning Policy Working Group notes and considers the contents of the new evidence base produced since the close of the last stage of consultation on the Local Plan.

## Financial Implications

4. The preparation of new and updated evidence to address the responses received to the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan and support the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan has been met from the planning budget.

## Background Papers

5. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.
  - [Uttlesford Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan](#);
  - Paper on Garden Communities Trajectory;

- Paper on stepping the housing trajectory;
- Water Cycle Study Phase 2
- Transport Study update
- Brief Archaeological Impact Assessment
- Draft Full Heritage Impact Assessment
- Retail Study update
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan

## Impact

6.

Communication/Consultation	<p>Consultation on the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan took place between 12 July and 4 September 2017.</p> <p>Consultation on the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan is planned for June 2018.</p>
Community Safety	This is an underlying theme of the Local Plan.
Equalities	The Regulation 18 Local Plan was subject to an equalities impact assessment and this will be reviewed and updated for the Regulation 19 Local Plan.
Health and Safety	Health and safety matters are part of the Plan's content and are considered as part of the sustainability appraisal/ strategic environmental assessment of the Plan.
Human Rights/Legal Implications	The Local Plan will need to comply with human rights and planning legislation. Once adopted it will form part of the statutory development plan.
Sustainability	This is an underlying theme of the Local Plan e.g. ensuring homes and jobs are provided near to each other and minimising reliance on the private car. The Plan is subject to sustainability appraisal/ strategic environmental assessment throughout its preparation.
Ward-specific impacts	Some wards may be affected by site specific proposals but the overall spatial strategy for the Plan is a matter for all wards.

Workforce/Workplace	This will involve Councillors, officers from the Planning Policy Team and others as necessary.
---------------------	--

## Situation

7. Public consultation was held between 12 July and 4 September 2017 on the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan. Nearly 6,000 representations have been received from over 2,000 individuals and organisations. These responses have all been uploaded onto the Council's consultation portal and are available to read [online](#).
8. Reports were brought before PPWG on 17 October and 29 November, which summarised the representations and highlighted key issues for further work.
9. As a result of these representations the Council has progressed updates to various pieces of evidence in order to address the technical issues that have arisen from the regulation 18 consultation over the summer.
10. At PPWG on 17 April a report was brought before the working group looking at the updated evidence base on:
  - West Essex and East Hertfordshire Assessment of Employment Needs and the Essex, Southend-on-Sea; and
  - Thurrock Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment Summary 2016-2033.
11. This report looks at the following evidence base updates.
  - Paper on Garden Communities Trajectory;
  - Paper on stepping the housing trajectory;
  - Water Cycle Study Phase 2
  - Transport Study update
  - Brief Archaeological Impact Assessment
  - Draft Full Heritage Impact Assessment
  - Retail Study update
  - Infrastructure Delivery Plan
  - Update on the Whole Plan Viability Study
  - Update on the Hatfield Forest Work
  - Update on the Epping Forest Work
  - Update on the Sports and Playing Pitches Study
12. Where it is possible and appropriate to do so these studies are appended to this report. Further detail of these reports can be found below:

## **Paper on Garden Communities Trajectory**

13. Officers have reviewed the delivery rates on the Garden Communities following comments at the regulation 18 Local Plan and taking into account the views of the site promoters for the Garden Communities.
14. This concludes that it is appropriate to move back the start date for delivery on Easton Park and North Uttlesford Garden Communities from 2021/22 to 2022/23. This allows another year before completions are expected on site, providing a more robust trajectory that can better deal with issues that arise; it also reflects the recommendation to guide these developments through Development Plan Documents.
15. The paper also concludes that in later years the Garden Communities will be able to deliver increased numbers of dwellings.
16. This paper is appended to the report at Appendix 1.

## **Paper on stepping the housing trajectory**

17. Officers have reviewed the possibility of 'stepping' the housing requirement in the Local Plan. A stepped trajectory means that the Council will have a lower housing target in the early years of the plan and a higher target in later years. This reflects the fact that delivery of the Garden Communities will be later in the plan period.
18. Including a stepped trajectory in the Local Plan means that, once the plan is adopted the Council's five year land supply requirement will better reflect the strategy in the Local Plan.
19. This paper is appended to this report at Appendix 2.

## **Water Cycle Study Phase 2**

20. A Detailed Water Cycle Study (WCS) is required by the Environment Agency to update the 2017 high level WCS. It looks in more detail at growth impacts on Waste Water Recycling Centres and water quality in rivers.
21. The study was prepared by Arcadis on behalf of the Council to assess the impacts of growth on:
  - Water resources
  - Current water and wastewater infrastructure
  - The water environment
22. The study area covers the whole of the district and also parts of adjacent districts as advised by the Environment Agency and the relevant water bodies.
23. Given the size of the 3 preferred Garden Communities the EA asked that the focus of the study be on the impacts of these developments.

24. Water resources/ supply: Affinity Water have undertaken a strategic modelling exercise of Water Resource Zone 5 (Stort), which has assessed the combined hydraulic impact on the network of the Local Plan growth/large new developments in the surrounding boroughs. On a strategic level, the modelling shows that to meet the demand of the new developments within the Uttlesford District, water will continue to be brought into this catchment from the west. This is already the case, with water moved around the network to ensure demand is met resiliently. Strategic and local network reinforcements will be required to facilitate this increased demand, and to individually supply the larger site allocations. Uttlesford District Council has included a development management policy advised by the EA and partners to help mitigate impacts.
25. Waste Water treatment and Sewerage: No show stoppers found by this detailed WCS preventing timely delivery of a technically feasible option for the Garden Communities, by upgrading the impacted existing Water Recycling Centres
26. Due to the scale of the Garden Communities there is also an option to provide a new separate onsite WRCs to serve each community. However, the EA advise that in line with the current legislation, new discharges should first consider connecting to existing infrastructure where it is reasonable to do so. Initial discussions with the EA have discounted onsite WRCs at Easton Park and North Uttlesford.
27. Water quality: Results of the Indicative Water quality permits suggest the proposed growth will not lead to a deterioration of Water Directive status in receiving water courses.
28. Flooding: The EA did not require update of the 2016 Flood Risk Assessment. However further testing of extra flow from the proposals was carried out showing no significant change to the baseline situation with increased flow classified as having a low flood risk.
29. Conclusions: Going forward the detailed WCS is a living document and further detailed work will be completed for the Thames Water area regards impacts on water quality. The distribution of Garden Communities around the district helps address water quality issues by utilising locations with the largest rivers as well as those with smaller water courses. The Council has signed a joint position statement with the Environment Agency that sets out an agreed approach to future WCS work.
30. This paper is appended to the report at Appendix 3.

### **Transport Study update**

31. WYG has updated the Transport Study for the regulation 19 Local Plan. The Update builds on existing district transport study 2016/Addendum Report 2017 and is in response to issues raised as below.

32. Latest growth scenario/sensitivity tests: The study has tested and analysed 33 growth scenarios to help consider transport impacts. These scenarios are based on different;

- Levels of housing and employment growth
  - At 12,500 14,100 and 14,773 dwellings
- Growth distributions including;
  - two or three new garden communities
  - different growth levels in towns and villages

33. The latest growth trajectory for 14,733 dwellings (Appendix 4a) has been assessed using maximum peak period traffic flows rather than an average of the peaks as applied previously. This follows a request from Great Dunmow TC on the impacts of Easton Park (Appendix 4b). Using maximum peak period data provides a 'worst case' assessment and the results show more significant impacts on the A120(T) than before, although impacts are still within a level that the highway authorities have confirmed they are content to deal with by monitoring future performance with no immediate requirement to identify mitigation works.

34. Sustainable transport: A large part of the study is given over to understanding how the plan may improve the situation. This includes new local plan policies to achieve modal shift from the car in the new garden communities with ambitions for a step change to non-car modes. The latest scenarios test for a range of non-car modal shares.

35. Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow/villages: Essex County Council has been updated on the latest growth raising no issues on further modelling for allocations for the local plan.

36. Accessibility Scoring of Garden Community Options: The Update (Appendix 4c) includes a more detailed assessment with an expanded list of 19 accessibility criteria. The Addendum report 2017 explains why scoring was applied to options and reasons for discounting other Areas of Search. The update assesses the preferred Garden Communities;

- M11 J9a (North Uttlesford)
- West of Great Dunmow (Easton Park)
- West of Braintree

And for comparison purposes only, the following non-preferred;

- North of Takeley
- Chelmer Mead (Little Dunmow)
- Elsenham

37. In general apart from Elsenham and Little Dunmow each Area of Search scores well against most of the accessibility scoring categories, with most sites achieving good scores against each of the categories assessed. However, Little Dunmow scores less well on the criteria as it is more remote from

settlements with services. Little Dunmow contains very few services and is distant from the rail network. Elsenham scores less well on the criteria because it is further from employment opportunities, the nearest district centre, and the nearest point of access to the strategic road network. At this time there is no evidence to suggest an Elsenham scenario has acceptable traffic impacts (2017 Addendum) or could feasibly be made accessible to services.

38. Essex County Council has also indicated that a new junction onto the A120 would be required for Little Dunmow (Chelmer Mead). This would be challenging to deliver. This and the above assessment suggest that would be less preferable in terms of transport sustainability grounds
39. The remaining scenarios have similar overall assessment scores but Takeley would require a new junction onto the A120 to avoid unacceptable traffic impacts on built up areas. A sensitivity test also shows serious impacts on local roads. A new junction would be challenging to deliver. ECC have also informed UDC that serious impacts are likely to arise from a Takeley garden community at M11 J8 from queueing traffic without a new junction onto the A120. Such queues would impact on the strategic role of J8. Significant new development at Takeley would therefore be less preferable on these grounds.
40. Therefore, having regard to link capacity impacts, accessibility and sustainable transport the appraisals have found that the following locations would be preferable in transport terms for new garden communities:
  - Great Chesterford
  - Easton Park
  - West of Braintree
41. These locations have good access to the Strategic Road Network, are accessible to jobs and settlements with services. Great Chesterford has good access to walking and cycling facilities and is close to a rail station. Great Dunmow is more distant from a rail station but is better served by buses as is West of Braintree. West of Braintree is more distant from settlements but this is balanced by the promotion of the GC for a large co-terminus new settlement with associated/ accessibility improvements.
42. The study has identified key infrastructure including an acceptable approach to mitigation at the M11 J8 interchange and to strategic junctions in South Cambridgeshire on the A505 corridor.
43. A505 corridor impacts: South Cambridgeshire DC, Cambridgeshire CC, and Great Chesterford PC requested that further assessment work be undertaken to examine:
  - More committed development growth from outside the district in Cambs/Herts/Suffolk and impacting on the A505 corridor
  - Refined VISUM modelling zones to more accurately reflect the spatial distribution of committed development/employment areas within South Cambs

44. The results (Appendix 4d) show that the A505 requires strategic improvement to meet requirements on the corridor but that the contribution of local plan growth is modest.
45. CCC has asked that a full strategic study be in place to inform the local plan. As a result UDC produced an interim feasibility study of A505 options (Appendix 4e) to promote study work in the corridor showing that solutions are available without undue constraint. CCC has since then gained funding for a full A505 study to examine a wide range of improvements.
46. M11 Junction 8: Interim improvement schemes have been identified by the County Council to provide additional traffic capacity at the junction. These are fully funded. Highways England is currently pursuing work for a long term solution via a RIS 2 bid on M11 J8.
47. Overall Study Conclusions: The assessment of the scenarios shows that the strategic and local road network could be a potential constraint to local plan development. It is therefore important to locate development where it minimises these impacts.
48. The Submission Options have less development on the A120 and less impact on the district overall. North Uttlesford would use junction M11 J9 rather than J8. The approach spreads growth and the resulting traffic around the district and its highway network. It utilises the connectivity of the A120 and M11 while minimising impact on key junctions especially M11 J8.
49. These papers are appended to the report at Appendix 4.

### **Brief Archaeological Impact Assessment**

50. At Regulation 18 consultation on the Uttlesford Local Plan Historic England and Essex County Council required that a Brief Archaeological Impact Assessment be undertaken. Following discussion with ECC and HE the work looked at Garden Communities in the Local Plan (Easton Park, North Uttlesford and West of Braintree). ECC Place Services prepared the Study on the Council's behalf to consider the potential impact of the above Garden Communities. The assessment looks at important views impacted, the contribution made by the setting of assets, potential harm, enhancement, and mitigation.
51. NUGC: A number of areas of potential harm are identified/recommends approach to the issues including avoiding obstructing the visual links between Roman town and Temple (Scheduled Ancient Monuments). A number of specific mitigation measures are identified for consideration for the HIA and master planning stage of developing the site. In conclusion the GC lies within a highly sensitive landscape containing numerous heritage assets. A comprehensive approach is needed to guide future development while it should be recognised at an early stage there are assets that cannot take development sensitively. A HIA should be undertaken to consider what parts of the site are suitable for development and those to retain as undeveloped.



52. Easton Park: A number of areas of potential harm are identified/recommends approach to the issues including a Conservation Management Plan. A number of specific mitigation measures are identified for consideration for the HIA and master planning stage of developing the site. In conclusion this GC requires a HIA to identify assets with integration of built heritage, Park/Garden, non-designated assets and archaeological deposits. Rural landscape/setting should be integral part of the Garden Community.
53. West of Braintree: A number of areas of potential harm are identified/recommends approach to the issues including appropriate assessment of Roman settlement. A number of specific mitigation measures are identified for consideration for the HIA and master planning stage of developing the site. In conclusion this GC requires assessment of the Roman estate alongside conservation area, listed buildings and a protected lane.
54. This paper is appended to the report at Appendix 5.

### **Draft Full Heritage Impact Assessment**

55. At regulation 18 consultation on the Uttlesford Local Plan Historic England required the production of Full Heritage Impact Assessments for the proposed Garden Communities in order to inform the Local Plan.
56. The study was prepared by Donald Insall Associates on behalf of the Council to consider the potential impact of development on heritage assets in the three Garden Communities proposed in the Local Plan (Easton Park, North Uttlesford and West of Braintree). Heritage Impact Assessments were also prepared for three alternative sites at Elsenham, Chelmer Park and Takeley (Priors Green).
57. The study identifies potential impacts on the significance of heritage assets for all three proposed Garden Communities. It also identifies measures to mitigate these impacts.
58. Easton Park: the study considers that there is the potential to harm the significance of heritage assets. However the study considers there is scope for development on the site and identifies various measures to mitigate these potential impacts.
59. North Uttlesford: the study considers that development on the site will harm the significance of heritage assets. However, the study identifies the careful mitigation approaches and measures to guide development to ensure assets are respected and impacts minimised. The HIA identifies areas with development potential and areas which to remain undeveloped. Work on the DPD / masterplans for the site will be able to look at this in more detail.
60. West of Braintree: the study considers that there is the potential to harm the significance of heritage assets. However the study considers there is scope for development on the site and identifies various measures to mitigate these potential impacts.

61. This study is not the end of the heritage work that will need to be completed prior to the examination hearings and as part of the detailed DPD work. Further work will be needed on below-ground and upstanding heritage assets to inform the layout of these developments and give more detail on the appropriate mitigation. This work will be required to inform the Development Plan Documents that will follow the Local Plan and the subsequent planning applications on the sites.
62. For the North Uttlesford Garden Community site. Development of the North Uttlesford Garden Community site will have to be treated with particular care and with the necessary evidence. The sensitivity of heritage assets on the North Uttlesford Garden Community site is reflected in the lower number of homes expected (5k) within the area of search compared to the other two proposed garden communities (10k each).
63. This paper is appended to the report at Appendix 6.

### **Retail Study update**

64. This study updates the 2016 Retail Capacity Study and provides evidence in relation to retail matters in the Local Plan. The key areas which have been updated are
- The planning policy context;
  - Update of the retail facilities within the main towns of the District and surrounding towns; and
  - Review of the population and retail expenditure data underpinning the capacity exercises and carrying out the data horizon through to 2033.
65. The purpose of the Study is to examine the existing shopping patterns in the area, the nature and content of the shopping facilities within the district and the need for additional facilities, if any, over the period until 2033. In order to fully appreciate shopping behaviour, a broad appraisal was also made of the major retail facilities beyond the District since it was evident that significant proportions of convenience and, in particular, comparison expenditure, was being attracted to those facilities. An important objective of the Study is to assess whether, for sustainable and other planning reasons, the existing patterns should be modified and, if so, to determine the consequences in terms of additional retail floorspace within the defined centres. The Study looks in particular at the main centres of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow and to a lesser extent the smaller centres of Stansted Mountfitchet and Thaxted and additionally the town centre's outside of Uttlesford that draw trade from the District.
66. The study has found that Uttlesford is relatively well served in terms of main food shopping with little leakage to competing convenience shops outside the District. In terms of capacity the study concludes that by 2033 a large food store could be delivered at Great Dunmow and a small to medium sized food store could be supported in Saffron Walden. The study recommends that their locations should preferably be in or on the edge of the respective town centres.

67. Policy RET1 of the Regulation 18 Local Plan plans for a small to medium sized food store in both Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow. The policy will be updated to take into account the 2018 Study and the capacity for a large food store in Great Dunmow by 2026.
68. In relation to comparison shopping in Saffron Walden there is a need for just under 5,000m<sup>2</sup> by 2026. In Great Dunmow the study only identifies a limited increase in capacity and therefore does not recommend identifying land for additional comparison shopping. Stansted Mountfitchet and Thaxted are primarily used for convenience shopping and the study concludes that there is no capacity for non-food retail development in either village.
69. The updated study does not require a change to the policy which identifies capacity for additional comparison floorspace by 2026 of 5,000m<sup>2</sup> in Saffron Walden and none in Great Dunmow.
70. The Regulation 18 Local Plan Policy RET1 sets a retail hierarchy of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow as town centres, local centres at Stansted Mountfitchet and Thaxted and proposes local centres in the three Garden Communities. The Study has reviewed this and found that the hierarchy is still valid.
71. The Local Plan policies for the Garden Communities require the inclusion of a new local centre incorporating retail, business and community land uses. The consultants have produced an addendum to the 2018 Retail Study providing an assessment of the retail floorspace arising in the proposed Garden Communities. At Easton Park and at North Uttlesford Garden Communities, the consultants consider that a small top-up food store is likely to be viable and sustainable due to expenditure arising from the population generated by the new housing. On their own, the 970 dwellings within Uttlesford at the West of Braintree Garden Community are unlikely to make new retail floorspace commercially viable; however this does not take into account the development within Braintree. The addendum also looks at potential retail needs in the Garden Communities beyond the plan period to inform the masterplanning work. However, the increased uncertainty the further into the future the study looks means this is for illustrative purposes only.
72. This paper and additional documents are appended to the report at Appendix 7.

### **Infrastructure Delivery Plan**

73. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared alongside the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan and has since been updated to reflect the scale of growth and spatial distribution of this outlined in the Regulation 19 version Local Plan. This has involved liaison with and input from infrastructure service providers with responsibility for:
- Physical infrastructure, e.g.: Transport, utilities, water and waste
  - Social infrastructure, e.g.: Education, healthcare, emergency services and other community facilities, including sports and play space

- Green infrastructure, e.g.: Country Parks, natural and semi-natural green space.

74. The IDP includes details of infrastructure identified as being needed to support the delivery of growth as outlined in the Local Plan. Schedules have been prepared and sit alongside the IDP, outlining infrastructure requirements for different locations and growth areas. These also establish, where known and available, information relating to infrastructure costs and responsibilities for delivery. It is important to note that the IDP addresses strategic infrastructure priorities as distinct from very localised infrastructure needs arising from individual planning applications.

75. The IDP is a 'living document' and as development proposals become more detailed, so the schedules in the IDP will be updated.

76. Key findings from the IDP are summarised below:

Physical Infrastructure:

77. Interim solutions have been funded to relieve current traffic pressure at M11 Junction 8, although longer-term solutions are required. Highways England is in the process of investigating potential interventions to help determine investment in the Department for Transport's next Road Investment Strategy.

78. With regard to the Garden Communities, access is considered feasible. However, further monitoring and testing of access arrangements with regard to Easton Park are required.

79. All major growth locations are required to deliver a package of sustainable travel measures, including bus, walking and cycling routes. This includes delivery of improved access to the railway stations within the district.

Social infrastructure:

80. New school provision is required as part of the Garden Communities in line with guidance on school size provided by Essex County Council. Provision may cater for need arising from growth in existing towns and settlements in the District. Equally, additional school places may be provided for through expansion of existing facilities.

81. New health care provision will also be required within the District. The Clinical Commissioning Group has advised that a new hub facility would most likely be needed in Great Dunmow and that the proposed Garden Communities should also include health centres.

82. There is potential for new open space, play space, sports provision and allotments to be masterplanned into new development proposals. Subject to future models, it may be that some of this provision could be provided alongside or within new school sites.

83. The findings of the Water Cycle Study are outlined above. Upgrades will be required to the foul sewerage network, with growth at the Garden

Communities placing additional pressure on this. The Water Cycle Study concludes that there is no major reason that would prevent timely delivery of at least one suitable and technically feasible option for the Garden Communities, by upgrading infrastructure owned by Anglian Water or Thames Water.

1. Sufficient capacity is considered available within the electricity network to support growth in the short-term. However, longer-term, new networks and or primary sub-stations will be require at the Garden Communities.
84. An ongoing review of waste facilities and provision is required as existing household waste facilities both within and surrounding the district are at or near capacity.

Green infrastructure:

85. There is a need for a new Country Park in the district, to increase provision and relieve pressure on the Hatfield Forest. The proposed garden Communities, which include good levels of green space provision, lend themselves to provision of a new Country Park. There is a need for ongoing discussion as to how such a facility will be managed and maintained.
86. This paper is appended to the report at Appendix 8.

**Update on the Whole Plan Viability Study**

87. The Council recognises the importance of producing a plan that is viable and deliverable. In March 2017, Troy Planning + Design and Three Dragons were commissioned prepare the Whole Plan Viability Study. Emerging findings from the evidence have assisted the Council in drawing up the Local Plan, including its affordable housing policies.
88. The evidence has been prepared in consultation with the development industry (including a stakeholder workshop) and has followed the relevant regulations and guidance and is in-line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
89. Following consultation on the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) modelling assumptions have been refreshed as necessary to reflect the content of the Pre-Submission Local Plan. This includes taking account of representations received where these may affect testing along with any other revisions to policies. The latest testing assumptions are based on the most recent evidence for development costs and values within Uttlesford, both of which have shown relatively small increases since early 2017.
90. The appointed consultants have worked closely with Officers throughout to identify the viability implications of the approach to policy topics including accessibility, housing for older people, energy efficiency and housing mix. Testing assumptions make allowances for the extent of planning obligations likely to be secured in the future. The refresh has been undertaken alongside completion of the IDP to provide clarity on the viability implications of future infrastructure requirements.

91. Testing is representative of sites proposed in the Local Plan. Case studies, ranging from 1 to 400 dwellings, have been assessed. Assumptions have been updated where necessary to better reflect the policies of the Pre-Submission Local Plan. These now consider a broader range in terms of scale, location and density of development, as well as the viability of opportunities to deliver self-build and custom housing. To gain an overall picture of viability generic testing is also undertaken for notional 1-hectare sites at different densities e.g. 25 to 40 dwellings per hectare.
92. Results of updated testing taking account of the Pre-Submission Local Plan are now being finalised. These will initially be available as a 'Summary of Findings' paper available at the 23 May PPWG meeting. Current outputs are still subject to review but provide a strong indication of positive viability against the policies of the Local Plan. This is consistent with findings from testing undertaken during preparation of the Draft Local Plan.
93. For 1-hectare sites, residual development values all exceed assumed land value benchmarks when taking account of differences in development costs and revenues for the District. Surpluses range between around 100% and 225% in addition to the price available to pay for land. Testing of the Draft Local Plan gave an equivalent range of surpluses around 117% to 261%. The small reduction in surplus predominantly reflects revision of policies and revised assumptions for development costs to achieve these outcomes.
94. Results from case studies modelled produce a wider range, taking account of scheme size, different levels of planning obligations and allowances for sensitivity testing. The pattern of results nevertheless indicates that the policies of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, including delivery of 40% Affordable Housing, can be achieved across a range development types.
95. Findings from testing of the Garden Community case studies will be presented separately from the Summary of Findings paper. Consultation on the Regulation 18 Consultation confirmed the Council's preferred spatial strategy and proposed location of new Garden Communities. This has enabled more detailed testing assumptions to be prepared. Finalisation of these assumptions has been significantly assisted by progress on the wider evidence base, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
96. Testing takes account of assumptions for the phasing of development and infrastructure provision (and associated costs) and delivery of the housing trajectory. Further engagement with site promoters has been sought to ensure that the Garden Community case studies used for modelling purposes are representative of the development assumptions in these locations. A further update will be provided at the 31 May PPWG meeting regarding testing assumptions and the modelling process for these case studies.

### **Update on the Hatfield Forest Work**

97. The Hatfield Forest Visitor Survey and Impact Management study 2018, was undertaken by Footprint Ecology on behalf of the National Trust to gain visitor data on attitudes and behaviours to gauge usage levels and impact. A 'zone

of influence', was established identifying where forest visitors are drawn from to compare with projected demand. The report analysed the patterns of the key users of the forest, and found the majority of users were frequent users, mainly dog walkers visiting the forest by car, and that many would be tempted to use alternative greenspaces if they were provided.

98. The report indicates that with increases in housing stock proposed in the Local Plan, visitor numbers will grow. To mitigate the negative impacts of increased usage the report recommends a number of active measures such as the cordoning off of rides (paths within the Forest), allowing them to recover organically and the introduction of a traffic light system indicating the condition of the rides. The passive measures include improved educational and enhanced visitor messaging.
99. Provision of new open spaces in the southern part of the district will help to alleviate this significant pressure on Hatfield Forest. This can be achieved through the masterplans of the new garden communities.
100. At this point in time the National Trust has not published this report, but the Council has been working with them and is being kept abreast of the findings and officers are satisfied that there are no issues that are not capable of being resolved.

### **Update on the Epping Forest Work**

101. The Epping Forest Visitor Survey 2017, was undertaken by Footprint Ecology on behalf of the City of London, Epping Forest District Council and the four signatory local authorities including Uttlesford District Council, to better understand the use of the forest and for the results to underpin the preparation of a joint strategy which will address the impacts of increased recreational use stemming from local plan development. Epping Forest is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and is located within the 15km buffer zone of Uttlesford as identified by the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Therefore our district is considered to have a potential impact on the forest.
102. The 2017 survey provides a rich background into the history and current status of the forest with regard to its current usage, management and ecological status. It largely examines the impacts of increased demand rather than the technical implications of the forest's ecological function. This should be viewed as a snapshot into how the forest is used.
103. The 2017 work is now informing ongoing work that is considering the implications of the increased usage in the vicinity of the forest. This includes the traffic related air quality effects on Epping Forest, and an approach to inform how to manage visitor access.
104. Our HRA is being updated to take account of the most updated evidence with regard to the forest. However, our impacts are considered to be low compared to other areas close to the forest such as Epping and the London authorities.

105. At this point in time the report is not available for publication, but the Council has had sight of a draft and publication is expected shortly. Officers are satisfied that there are no issues that are not capable of being resolved.

### **Update on the Sports and Playing Pitches Study**

106. The Council has tendered for and is about to commission consultants to undertake a Sport Facilities and Recreation Strategy.
107. The Council has worked with Sport England, Active Essex and the Council's Communities Team in writing the specification, and the consultant will continue to work with these groups in undertaking the project and preparing the strategy. Due to the requirement to assess winter and summer sports facilities at the appropriate time of year, the strategy will take a year to complete and the final version should be published in April 2019. The emerging policy on Protection and Provision of Open Space, Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches will make reference to using findings of the most up to date strategy and standards. This approach is supported by Sport England.
108. The overarching aim of the project is to provide a detailed evidence based assessment of the existing sport and recreation facilities in Uttlesford, the sport and recreational needs of the future residents of Uttlesford up to 2033 but also beyond in relation to the proposed Garden Communities; and a clear strategy for the provision of sport and recreational facilities to meet this need in the potential growth areas. Furthermore, the Strategy has a role beyond planning as it can be used by the Communities Team, Active Uttlesford Network and other delivers to assist in the Council's health and wellbeing work.
109. In relation to open space and equipped play areas the Strategy will identify local needs, audit local provision, set and apply provision standards. The strategy will recommend sites to be protected, sites to be enhanced, sites surplus to requirements and proposals and opportunities to address surpluses or deficiencies.
110. In relation to playing pitch and outdoor sports facilities the Strategy will gather and assess information and views on the supply and demand for the facilities and develop a strategy. The strategy will help prioritise investment and address issues identified through the assessment of the facilities. Sport England has moved away from the use of traditional standards-based approaches of hectares per 1000 population provision, therefore the consultants will provide tools and guidance to use the strategy to inform planning guidance, and negotiate and secure developer contributions.
111. In relation to indoor and built facilities the Strategy will, as with pitches and outdoor facilities gather and assess information and views on the supply and demand for the facilities and develop a strategy. The strategy will, amongst other things, outline the provision needed to cater for current and future demand; identify investment and rationalisation options for the Council; identify key requirements to improve or replace facilities and identify



stakeholders to work with to improve service delivery and ensure facilities have a health and social impact.

### **Actions from previous PPWGs**

112. At PPWG on 14 December 2017 for below action points were recorded. The table underneath this paragraph sets out how these have been actioned.

	<b>Action</b>	<b>What has been done</b>
General point	Continue to pursue wider engagement in the development of the Local Plan.	Meetings have been held with a number of Parish Councils. The Council has also appointed consultants who specialise in engagement to lead this work in the future.
PP7	Amend Elsenham Parish Council's representation summary to policy INF1 as per the email received from Elsenham Parish Council.	Summary amended prior to responding to key issues.
PP8	Provide books for comments at Local Plan Forums, and can offer to minute comments for those not comfortable with writing.	We can provide books for people to write comments on at future forums and where people need assistance writing their comments officers will assist them.
PP8	Consider a new section in the Local Plan covering Neighbourhood Plans.	The drafting of the regulation 19 Local Plan has included a section on Neighbourhood Plans.
PP11	Investigate building provisions of policy S7 into the proposed SP10 policy.	Previous assessments of policy S7 against the NPPF identified it as being only partly consistent with the NPPF, identifying a concern that it was not positively worded. Nevertheless, officers have looked again at policy SP10, and the drafting seeks to identify acceptable uses within the countryside, other uses are not permitted.
PP12	Investigate whether housing density is measured by the number of houses over an entire area, or over the space taken up by houses within that area.	Housing density is a measure of the number of dwellings that can be built on a site. The density ranges identified in policy H1 are net density (i.e. dwellings per hectare in a site excluding land for infrastructure).

		<p>The appropriate density for the Garden Communities will be determined through the relevant development plan document.</p>
PP12	<p>Investigate the possibility of lowering the proposed density of housing to reflect similar densities in other districts.</p>	<p>The figures in the policy are based on the Urban Capacity Study work carried out in 2005. This provided an indication as to the range of densities of various styles of developments that already exist and with which people are familiar, they are not considered to be too high.</p> <p>The draft policy allows flexibility by allowing consideration of the location of the development and having regard to the Design Policies. However, it is accepted that this flexibility could be made clearer in the policy and it is proposed to include reference to the character of the area.</p>
PP12	<p>Officers should look to update the evidence base regarding the necessary housing mix.</p>	<p>The housing mix policy is based on the available information in the West Essex and East Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).</p> <p>Officers have updated the monitoring processes to make monitoring the mix of housing easier in the future.</p>
PP13	<p>Ensure there is a balance between connectivity between new and current settlements, such as footpaths and bridleways, and mitigating the effects of new settlements.</p>	<p>Officers have looked at the transport policies again to ensure that existing public rights of way are protected and appropriate new links are considered.</p>
PP15	<p>Consider solutions to rat running in existing villages.</p>	<p>Preventing rat running must be considered on a case-by-case basis. The transport policies have in the plan been</p>

		redrafted to require transport assessments and travel plans to assess the impact and mitigation required.
PP16	Consider a standalone Green Infrastructure Policy	Officers have considered a standalone Green Infrastructure policy, it was not considered necessary as the topic of green infrastructure is comprehensively covered in the local plan. For the Garden Communities, a Green Infrastructure Plan is required.
PP18	Reconsider the wording of policy EN16 to make it more robust, and look at initiatives that the Council should take forward to ensure development did not adversely affect air quality in management areas.	Officers have rewritten this policy seeking to make the policy more robust.
PP19	Look at making sure Policies C1 and C4 were more positively worded.	Officers have looked again at these policies, and some minor changes are proposed.
PP21	Bring a monitoring plan to the Planning Policy Working Group meeting. This should also cover how the TCPA principles will be monitored	Appendix 2, the monitoring framework, has been looked at address how the local plan will be monitored.  The development plan documents for the Garden Communities will set out in more detail how the Garden Community Principles will be met. The monitoring framework for these DPDs will set out how these policies will be monitored.
PP23	Investigate why Stansted Mountfitchet Council's representation were mentioned in the late representations chapter.	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council's representations were received on 8 September 2017, four days after the end of the regulation 18 consultation. This has not have a material impact on the representations considered, as the representations for the Parish Council were the same as those for the Neighbourhood Plan Group,

		and the Neighbourhood Plan Group's representations were received in time.
PP23	Provide a list of topics mentioned at the beginning of the minutes of the meeting.	The PPWG minutes for 14 December are structured with topic headings.
PP23	Give some thought to how to clearly present how representations were being responded to, when bringing draft responses to the working group.	Key points have been drawn out from representations and responded to. This give a clear response to the key issues emerging from the representations.

113. At PPWG on 17 April 2017 for below action points were recorded. The table underneath this paragraph sets out how these have been actioned.

	<b>Action</b>	<b>What has been done</b>
PP25	To amend PP12 of the minutes of 14 December 2017 as agreed.	This has been actioned.
PP25	To write to members of the working group to explain how the action points from the meeting on 14 December 2017 had been followed up. This to include work examining policy SP10.	See the above table.
PP25	To consider the Community Infrastructure Levy at a Group Leaders meeting before bringing the work back to the working group.	Reference to a potential CIL has been included in the draft plan.  Developing a CIL will take some time. Evidence base is required to be developed, followed by consultation, and then the document is examined by a planning inspector.  CIL cannot be adopted without an adopted up to date Local Plan.
PP25	To arrange another member session regarding planning policy with the Development Management Leader.	This has been arranged for 16 May.

PP26	To respond to T Clarke's question about how many jobs there were present in Uttlesford District at present and how many there would be in 2033.	In 2016 there were 47,000 jobs in Uttlesford, of which 39,000 were 'employee jobs' <sup>1</sup> .  The regulation 19 Local Plan will plan for job growth of 16,000 from 2011 to 2033. The number of jobs in Uttlesford in 2011 was 42,000; therefore the number of jobs in 2033 will be 58,000.
PP26	To follow up the discrepancy between moderated and preferred baseline figures for total FEMA jobs created between 2011 and 2016, and to respond to members about this.	The discrepancy between jobs growth 2011-16 between the moderated baseline and the preferred scenario is due to the fact that both of these levels of growth are 'modelled growth' and not necessarily reflecting reality.  In reality jobs growth between 2011 and 2016 was 5,000, this is the same as the growth indicated in the moderated baseline, and 2,400 lower than identified in the preferred scenario.
PP26	To give members sight of proposed new site allocations in advance of publication of the agenda for the next meeting of the working group.	This has been arranged through the Group meetings.
PP27	To respond to members with an explanation for why the response rate to the survey was low in Uttlesford.	Officers are still following this up.

## Risk Analysis

114.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
If the Council does not have NPPF compliant evidence the	2 - Unlikely	Delays in adopting the Local Plan	Making sure that the evidence is up to date and in accordance with the relevant

▪ <sup>1</sup> [Nomis Local Authority Profile for Uttlesford](#)

Local Plan could be found unsound			regulations and NPPF.
-----------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.